DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 206 UD 016 177

TITLE	The Honolulu Buddy System Project: Training, Evaluation and Research. Final Report, July 1, 1970 to September 30, 1973.
INSTITUTION	Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. Social Welfare Development and Research Center.
REPORT NO	SWDRC-R-123
PUB DATE	Nov 73
NOTE	28p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Adolescents; Court Role; Cross Age Teaching; *Delinquency Prevention; Delinquent Rehabilitation; Delinquents; Dropout Prevention; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Federal Programs; Individual Instruction; Individualized Programs; Juvenile Courts; *Program Effectiveness; Success Factors; Teaching Techniques; *Tutorial Programs; *Tutors; Young Adults; Youth Problems; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Hawaii (Honolulu); *Honolulu Buddy System Project

ABSTRACT

A summary and highlight of the significant developments, major accomplishments and important research findings of the three years of operation of the Honolulu Buddy System Project is contained in this document. In addition, the implications that the research data have generated, along with further directions to be explored are included. Most importantly, the report specifies the exact ways in which the Family Court can incorporate the concept and techniques demonstrated by the Buddy System into the existing Family Court structure and how they may effectively be utilized by the present staff. Significant achievements that are identified include the following: (1) participation in the program does not in and of itself increase school attendance; (2) the utilization of the principles and techniques of behavior modification is effective in the treatment of youth participating in the project; and (3) nonprofessionals can be trained to become effective change agents when working with youth. Among the problem areas that are listed are the following: the administrative delays in processing contracts and hiring personnel, the inadequacies of the Youth Referral System, parental refusal to participate in projects due to labeling, the training of parents, and data collection by buddies and behavior analysts. A major consistent findings is that the Buddy System is most effective in reducing offenses than in preventing them. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED126206

A MODEL CITIES PROJECT

The Honolulu

BUDDY SYSTEM PROJECT

Training, Evaluation & Research

FINAL REPORT

July 1, 1970 to September 30, 1973

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE JUDICIARY

STATE OF HAWAII

UD 016177

School of Social Work * College of Health Sciences & Social Welfare

University of Hawaii

SOCIAL WELFARE DEVELOPMENT and RESEARCH CENTER

UD 016177

HONOLULU FAMILY COURT - FIRST CIRCUIT

Report 123

November, 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Honolulu Buddy System Project emanated from a concern among citizens of the Honolulu Model Cities neighborhoods, youth workers, and other social service practitioners regarding the growing problems relating to juvenile delinquency in Hawaii. The program was primarily financed by Federal funds secured and provided by the Honolulu Model Cities agency (City Demonstration Agency), City and County of Honolulu. It was sponsored and operated by The Judiciary through the Family Court - First Circuit, with the assistance of Model Neighborhood citizen groups in the Waianae-Nanakuli and Kalihi-Palama communities and the Social Welfare Development and Research Center of the University of Hawaii.

We wish to acknowledge the cooperation and support of the many individuals, representing the State and City agencies, who provided valuable counsel and support to enable our active participation during the entire three year duration of the project. Special appreciation is extended to Ms. Mary Jane Lee, Administrator of the Family Court's Children and Youth Services Branch, who provided able leadership through tireless effort in her capacity as Project Director.

We also wish to acknowledge the cooperation of the University of Hawaii School of Social Work, and the Departments of Psychology and Sociology for enabling more than 25 graduate and undergraduate students to participate in the project as consultants, trainers, researchers, assistant researchers and data collection specialists.

This Final Report was prepared through combined efforts by Ms. Dorothy Pluta - Project Coordinator; Ms. Kazue Odo - Family Court Probation Officer and Project Training Consultant during the third action year; Walter Fo,

Psychology graduate assistant; and Dr. Clifford O'Donnell, Researcher; and Assistant Director Robert Omura of this Center.

/s/ Jack T. Nagoshi, Director
Social Welfare Development
and Research Center

INTRODUCTION

This Final Report of the Honolulu Buddy System Project will attempt to summarize and highlight the significant developments, major accomplishments and important research findings of the three years the Buddy System was in operation: July 1, 1970 thru September 30, 1973. In addition, it will point out the implications that the research data have generated and further directions to be explored. Most importantly, this report will specify the exact ways in which the Family Court can incorporate the concept and techniques demonstrated by the Buddy System into the existing Family Court structure and how they may effectively be utilized by the present staff.

For a detailed account of each year's operation, the reader is referred to the following reports:

1st year 1. Final Report: An Evaluation of the First Year of the Buddy System, City Demonstration Agency, City and County of Honclulu, Hawaii, July, 1971.

2. The Buddy System Model: Community-Based Delinquency Prevention Utilizing Indigenous Non-Professionals as Behavior Change Agents, Social Welfare Development and Research Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, September, 1972.

2nd year 3. A Descriptive and Evaluative Report on the Buddy System: First Half of the Second Action Year (July 1, 1971 - December 31, 1971), Social Welfare Development and Research Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, January, 1972.

4. Buddy System Report: Third Quarter of the Second Action Year (January 1, 1972 - March 31, 1972), Social Welfare Development and Research Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, April, 1972.

5. Buddy System: Final Report of the Second Project Year, Social Welfare Development and Research Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, September, 1972.

6. Buddy System: Research Findings of the Second Project Year, Social Welfare Development and Research Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, June, 1973.

3rd year 7. Buddy System Report: First Quarter of the Third Action Year (July 1, 1972 - September 30, 1972), Social Welfare Development and Research Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, December, 1972.

8. Buddy System Report: Second and Third Quarters of the Third Action Year (October 1, 1972 - March 31, 1973), Social Welfare Development and Research Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, March, 1973.

9. Buddy System Project: Training, Evaluation & Research, Annual Report: 3rd Action Year (July 1, 1972 - July 31, 1973), Social Welfare Development and Research Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, July, 1973.

The Buddy System Project was operated under the sponsorship of The Judiciary, Family Court of Honolulu, Children and Youth Services Branch. The Project was terminated due to lack of state funds which were necessary to continue the program and also due to federal restrictions imposed on the Family Court for the use of HEW Title IV-A monies. During its operation the Buddy System was funded by the Honolulu Model Cities Agency which was

under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Additionally, supplemental grants were obtained from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (for the period July, 1970, through June, 1973).

The operating budget for a 12 month period averaged $130,000. During the first year of operation the cost was estimated at $110,000 while costs for the final year of operation amounted to an estimated $140,000. The increase in cost was due to an increase in personnel, fixed salary increases, and the hiring of Buddies for longer durations than in the first two years.

The primary objectives of the Buddy System Project were four-fold:

1. To promote non-delinquent behavior, academic achievement and/or occupational achievement during each project year for 120 youths who were dropouts, potential dropouts and delinquents. These were to be achieved through a) reducing delinquent behavior, b) improving school attendance, c) improving school performance, and d) improving relations with the family;
2. To demonstrate successful techniques for altering behavior of dropouts, potential dropouts and delinquents;
3. To demonstrate the value of para-professionals in the areas of delinquency prevention and control, rehabilitation, youth development and education; and
4. To increase the capabilities of agencies and personnel now dealing with youth development and rehabilitation.

The Buddy System Project objectives were directly related to the goals and objectives of the Honolulu Model Cities program. (For further specifics of Model Cities goals refer to report #1, page 2.)

TARGET POPULATION

The primary target population consisted of 120 school-age youths who were described as "potential dropouts, dropouts and delinquents" in the Kalihi-Palama and Waianae coast areas. The behaviors of these youths were characterized as poor school attendance, low academic performance, and curfew as well as other law violations. The youths were referred to the Buddy System through school counselors (schools referred from 80% to 90% of the youths), Family Court probation officers, police officers, parents and concerned residents.

During the three years of Project implementation, the target group was expanded slightly. During the first year, only intermediate age youngsters (junior high school) were recruited and serviced. In the second year of operation, high school students in the 10th grade were added to those who were previously eligible. During the third year, active recruitment and services were extended to elementary age youngsters (the youngest child being in the second grade) in addition to intermediate and high school youths.

The secondary target group was 40 residents of the Model Neighborhood Areas - 20 from Kalihi-Palama and 20 from the Waianae coast, ranging in age from 18 to 65 years, who served as Buddies to the youths. The Project attempted to equip the buddies with skills necessary for working with youths with behavioral problems and to supplement their incomes with $150 monthly stipends.

Each buddy was assigned an average of three youngsters with whom he was to meet weekly and to engage jointly in constructive social activities. Additionally, each buddy was held responsible for meeting regularly with parents, school counselors, and other significant adults in the youngster's

environment. Most importantly, the buddy attended regular training sessions (twice monthly) at which time he was instructed in the use of behavior management techniques to be utilized systematically in shaping prosocial behaviors.

Initially the buddies were paid for task completions over a two week payroll period on a "point system" basis. That is, they earned specific points for completion of each task assigned to them. Due to faulty methods by which it was administered by the agency which was hampered by fiscal limitations, the system was modified during the third year of the Project to better suit the needs of the operating agencies payroll system and expressions of need by the buddies. This area, however, continued to be a troublesome one which was never totally resolved, and will be further elaborated upon later in this report. In addition to their monthly stipends each buddy was also allowed $10 per youth per month reimbursement for "out-of-pocket" money to cover costs of treats, outings, etc.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

The Project operated under the Family Court, First Circuit, Children and Youth Services Branch, with the branch administrator serving as the project director. The position was responsible for the maintenance of general supervision over the program and its operation, including all fiscal matters. A full-time project coordinator was responsible for actual management of daily operations, including recruitment and selection of buddies and participating youths and coordination of training activities within the Project. Two area coordinators were hired on a half-time basis in October 1972 to assist in the administration of the Project. Their

responsibilities included assisting with recruitment of youths, assignment of youngsters to buddies, and supervision of buddies in the field.

Training, evaluation and research components of the Project were subcontracted with the Social Welfare Development and Research Center (SWDRC) of the University of Hawaii for each project year. Program direction and consultations in all aspects of the Project were provided on a sustained basis by the regular staff of the SWDRC.

The first year training staff was composed of two graduate students in clinical psychology who served as consultants and four behavior analysts who were graduate students in social work and psychology. During the second year, the behavior analysts included four probation officers and experienced buddies who were randomly selected to participate as trainers. During the third year of operation, six probation officers served in the capacity of trainers (behavior analysts) while one probation officer served as a training consultant. Six experienced buddies were also selected as behavior analysts and considered an integral part of the staff although they continued to perform their routine duties as buddies. For a more detailed account of the staffing pattern during each year of operation, please refer to Reports #1, #5, #9.

Generally, the administration of the Project remained quite stable over the three years of operation. The only major change occurred when the project coordinator position vacated and subsequently re-filled after the first year of operation. Further, the training staff was increasingly drawn from among the ranks of the Family Court and experienced buddies who participated during the first through the third years, thus fulfilling two general goals of the SWDRC, viz., steps toward institutionalizing the Project within an existing agency and the utilization of para-professionals for tasks heretofore performed only by professional staff.

METHODOLOGY

Immediately after recruitment and selection of 40 residents each from the Waianae and Kalihi-Palama areas initial orientation and training were provided to cover Model Cities goals, project objectives and the Project's relevance to the delinquency problem. Throughout the project year the buddies attended regular training sessions where they learned contingency management (behavioral) techniques. With the help and supervision of behavior analysts they were taught the necessary skills and techniques for direct application to the youngsters assigned to them. The training format was carried out by means of the triadic model of intervention (Tharp & Wetzel, 1969). In this operational schema, consultants (i.e. professionals) provide expertise and training to behavior analysts (i.e. nonprofessionals) who go into the home and school to instruct mediators (i.e. parents, teachers, and significant others in the youngster's natural environment) to alter the behaviors of the targets (i.e. deviant youth).

Different research questions were investigated in each of the first three years. In the first year control youngsters were compared with those in the Buddy System. The Buddy System youth were divided into three groups in which the assigned buddy provided either 1) a warm and positive relationship, 2) social approval for improvement of the target behavior, or 3) both social approval and $10 per month contingent on improvement of the target behavior. These three groups and the controls were then compared with respect to their relative improvement of the problems for which each youngster was referred.

In the second year youths who committed serious offenses in the prior year and youths with only minor or no offenses were assessed for their offense record during their participation in the Buddy System. Data were

collected on all Buddy System youths who participated during the Project's first two years as well as control youngsters.

During the third year data were collected via tests, ratings, interviews, etc. on the youths, buddies, behavior analysts, and parents. This information was correlated with improvement of the target behaviors to determine the aspects of the Buddy System which were most conducive to effectiveness with the youngsters.

For detailed information on these research investigations please refer to the annual reports for each of the first three years and Appendix B of this report.

SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS

During the three years that the program operated, the Project accomplished significant achievements in its stated objectives. Achievements which are identified include the following:

Objective #1. To promote non-delinquent behavior, academic achievement, and/or occupational achievement for 120 youths who are dropouts, potential dropouts and delinquents.

From an analysis of the available data, including school attendance records and court records, the following conclusion is drawn: Participation in the Buddy System does not in and of itself increase school attendance. Increases in attendance can only be expected from those youngsters for whom this was a target behavior.

Offense records show dramatic reductions in the number of youths committing offenses and in frequency of offenses committed by those youths who had offense records in the years prior to their entry into the Buddy System. The first two years' results also show that some youths who had no reported

offenses before they entered the project, did acquire them during their participation in the Buddy System. Among the youths in the latter group, one in five committed a major offense and one in four a minor offense. Clearly the Buddy System demonstrated that it was most effective in reducing offenses rather than preventing them and priority should be given to youths with prior offenses for entry into the Buddy System.[1]

Objective #2. To demonstrate successful techniques for altering behavior of dropouts, potential dropouts and delinquents.

The project successfully demonstrated that the utilization of the principles and techniques of behavior modification was effective in the treatment of youth participating in the Project. Buddies were successful in modifying their youngsters' behaviors when they correctly applied these techniques. The target behaviors included 1) attending school, 2) coming home on time, 3) helping siblings and parents around the house, and 4) interacting constructively with others.

Objective #3. To demonstrate the value of para-professionals in the areas of delinquency prevention and control, rehabilitation, youth development and education.

The Buddy System Project clearly demonstrated that non-professionals can be trained to become effective change agents when working with youth. Behavioral data collected throughout the first project year indicated that by instructing buddies in behavior management skills and by helping them implement intervention programs with their target youngsters, greater behavior change occurred than exhibited by youths in no treatment-control.[2]

---

1 & 2 Report #9, page 3.

There were additional indicators to support the notion that the use of para-professionals was valuable in youth prevention-treatment efforts. Within the Family Court staff many probation officers were observed to be working cooperatively with the buddies. Buddies and probation officers, alike, conferred on specific cases and worked jointly on intervention programs for identified youngsters. Buddies were seen sharing such tasks as accompanying their youths to court, visiting the detention home, etc. Probation officers often called on buddies regularly and welcomed their information and "feedback" regarding youth under Court supervision.

Observation #4. To increase the capabilities of existing agencies and personnel now dealing with youth development and rehabilitation.

During the three years of the Project's existence, the Family Court increased its commitment to the program by increasing the involvement of its probation officers from two who were participant-observers during the first year of operation, to seven probation officers during the third and final year. Among these, six probation officers served as behavior analysts and were responsible for the training and supervising of the buddies, while the seventh probation officer, who had served as a behavior analyst during the second year, acquired sufficient skills to serve as a training consultant during the third year. This demonstrated the increased integration of the buddy system model of intervention within the Family Court, and the enhancement of the capabilities of individuals employed in the human services.[3]

OTHER SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENTS

1. Demonstration of a training model for enhancing the effectiveness of non-professionals. A training package was developed by the SWDRC for

[3]Report #9, pages 6 & 7.

che Buddy System that was specifically designed to equip non-professionals with behavioral intervention skills necessary when working with problem oriented youths. This training package included a self-instructional programmed text that was designed to individualize the learning program and facilitate the training of non-professionals as effective change agents.[4] It holds much promise as a tool for training that can be utilized for agency staff development, thereby increasing the capabilities of existing social service agencies.[5] The training manual was developed during the second action year and tested during the third year by the participating buddies and staff. It was revised after the third training year and the final text is currently available at the SWDRC.

2. Successful implementation of an organizational model for the delivery of human services. The triadic model of intervention as demonstrated by the Buddy System combined the use of nonprofessional personnel and the techniques of behavior modification. In addition it successfully combined the use of nonprofessional and professional personnel in the delivery of effective services.[6]

3. Data collection, analysis and evaluation. The Buddy System was one of the few Model Cities projects which incorporated on-going research and objective annual evaluation into the total program. Throughout the duration of the program research activities were conducted by the Social Welfare Development and Research Center. The program operations were continuously modified in accordance with the results of data assessment.

---

[4]Report #9, page 5.

[5]Report #9, page 5.

[6]Report #9, page 6.

The Buddy System systematically evaluated its intervention and training procedures, discarded those that were ineffective and refined those that were effective.

4. Use of nonprofessionals as trainers of other nonprofessionals. During the second and third years of operation, the Buddy System used experienced returning buddies from previous years to train new buddies. This represented a significant step in providing resident beneficiaries of the Model Neighborhoods the experience needed to be employed in youth development and delinquency prevention endeavors. A number of buddies were hired for full-time positions by youth serving agencies as a result of their exposure, training and experience with the Buddy System, i.e., one buddy obtained a job as outreach counselor at Central Intermediate School, another buddy obtained a full-time job with the Waianae Rap Center, and a third buddy found employment with the Honolulu Police Department; also during the summers of 1972 and 1973 six buddies worked full-time as supervisors in the Model Cities Summer Youth Employment program.

PROBLEM AREAS

Throughout the duration of the Buddy System Project a number of problem areas were identified and continued to plague program operations and hamper its effectiveness. Some problems which arose during a particular period of time were resolved by administrative changes or modifications to the existing operational format. Other problems continued to occur throughout the three years. It should be noted that as these problems were recognized, sincere attempts were made to identify solutions at various levels but to no avail.

1. Administrative delays in processing contracts and hiring personnel. A delay in program implementation occurred at the beginning of each project

year due to the time consuming processing of contracts among the Model Cities agencies, the Judiciary, and the University of Hawaii. This delay, in turn, was responsible for the late recruitment of buddies and subsequent hiring of buddies which resulted in a late start for training and interventions.

2. Inadequacies of the Youth Referral System. During the first year of the Project there were insufficient youth referrals from cooperating agencies and other community resources. This hampered the prompt assignment of youth to buddies and further delayed the pooling of identified youths for control purposes which was needed for the research study. This problem was resolved somewhat during the second and third years of the program by the identification of a liaison within each referring school and by the area-coordinators, whose primary responsibility was to elicit referrals. School teachers and counselors apparently found it time consuming to complete the project referral form requested and as a result, the area-coordinators were increasingly depended upon to recruit target youths. Securing a large pool of referrals for control purposes continued to be a problem. As youths terminated their participation in the program they were replaced by those who had originally been placed in the control group. This latter condition depleted the number of youths available in the control group.

3. Refusal to participate in project due to "labeling". Because the program was operated by the Family Court many parents and youth alike tended to associate it with problem oriented or delinquent youth. Some parents refused to allow their youngsters to participate because they interpreted the participation under Family Court supervision undesirable.

4. Training of Parents. This was a major dimension explored and the Buddy System made several attempts to secure active parent involvement in

specially designed training sessions. When these sessions were attended by only a handful of parents, the use of incentives were explored but abandoned due to funding limitations of the Model Cities agency.

5. Data collection by buddies and behavior analysts. A recurring problem was the buddies' failure to collect sufficient data on the target behaviors of their youngsters. Although some buddies were reliable in this regard, many others were not. The problem was perpetuated when the behavior analysts accepted excuses for lack of data from their subordinates because they did not consider it important enough to pursue. Since data assessment was a significant element to the success of the behavior modification approach, the lack of data severely affected the objective evaluation of the program. Attempts were made to encourage and promote the systematic collection of data, including a change in the format under which the buddies were paid. Additionally, the behavior analysts not only failed to demand the data but they also failed to chart such data that were turned in by the buddies.

6. Earlier intervention of target behaviors by buddies. Due to previous experiences and lack of sufficient "practice theory" orientation, the buddies spent too much time getting "to know" their youngsters and resisted suggestions by the training staff to intervene earlier on target behaviors. Many buddies spent three to four months or longer, "associating" with a youngster before they began behavioral interventions. Once implemented, many intervention plans failed to account for criteria achievement. This latter situation led to many prolonged interventions, targeting on behaviors that had already been successfully modified.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FAMILY COURT

Three years of the Family Court's involvement in the Buddy System Project have produced several significant results. With full recognition of the problem areas, emphasis is placed on the consistent finding that offense records showed dramatic reductions in the number of youths committing offenses and in the number of offenses committed by those youths who had committed offenses in the year prior to their entry into the program. In short, it was clearly learned that the Buddy System was most effective in reducing offenses than in preventing them.

This reliable finding is in complete harmony with the basic goal of the Family Court to reduce deviant behavior of youth under probationary status. The methodology and concept identified and tested by Buddy System should not be ignored and set aside, merely because the Buddy System Project is no longer being administered by the Family Court.

With the full support of the Family Court administration, the behavioral approach can be used as one of the techniques employed by probation officers in dispensing services to their selected clientele. It is important to note that the Family Court's independent integration of the Buddy System techniques would not require additional funds nor manpower.

A sufficient number of probation officers have had sufficient training and experience in the Buddy System Project to serve as a team for a specified period of time to provide further demonstration and determine whether the behavioral approach is more effective than traditional casework in bringing about desired behavioral changes among juvenile probationers.

Properly implemented, the demonstration may result in 1) the probation officers utilizing the Conditions of Probation Order as a positive and

appropriate device to bring about desired behavioral changes; 2) greater utilization of the Volurteers In Probation (VIPs); 3) greater involvement and commitment of parents or guardians; 4) greater involvement of school personnel and other significant adults; 5) clearer record-keeping; and 6) most important, objective Court dispositions based on concrete findings, instead of vague, subjective findings.

EXAMPLES FOR IMPLEMENTATION:

1) Utilization of the CONDITIONS OF PROBATION ORDER as a positive and appropriate device to bring about desired behavioral changes.

Many case histories indicate that youths who are not attending school regularly become involved in law violations. One of the Conditions of Probation Order dictates to the youth, "Unless excused by this Court, attend school regularly. Do not behave at school in any manner which might cause you to be suspended or expelled."

Positively restated, the above condition orders desirable behavior to lessen the possibility of undesirable behavior. To enforce the order, the probation officers can motivate the youth to obey the order by developing a contract, which would spell out to the youth that his conforming to the order for a period of time would result in positive reinforcements, e.g. money, pleasure outings, and eventually, release from probation. The contract can be designed to accommodate successive approximations of the desired terminal behavior, thus assuring success in every instance of its application.

2) Greater utilization of the VOLUNTEERS IN PROBATION (VIPs).

In support of the Judiciary Department's endorsement and sponsorship of the VIP program, the implementation of the Buddy System techniques should increase the number of VIPs participating in Family Court activities.

Depending on the strengths and qualities of the VIP, probation officers can assign a VIP as (1) a buddy to a probationer, (2) a behavioral data collector and monitor, or (3) a behavior analyst. If VIPs participate in the program for a duration sufficient to develop close social relationships, they may even be designated as mediators in the triadic intervention model.

3) Greater involvement of parent(s) or guardian(s).

Implementation of the Buddy System concepts necessitates involvement of parent(s) or guardian(s) as (1) positive social reinforcers for desired behavior from the youth in the form of approval and acceptance, (2) behavioral data collectors and monitors, and/or (3) mediators.

4) Greater involvement of school personnel or other significant adults.

(Same points as #3)

5) Clearer record keeping.

Instead of preparing a cumulative narrative record of subjective and unfocused periodic summaries or chronological reports, the probationer's record can consist of progress reports, based on behavioral data with clear identification of the problem behaviors which are being modified.

For example, instead of

"Summary of Contacts from January to March: ...Probation officer maintained close contacts during this period. Based on reports obtained from the school counselor, John's school attendance and attitude towards his teachers had improved..."

the record can include the following:

"Summary of Contacts from January to March: ...Weekly contacts were maintained with Mr. Jones, school counselor, during this period. Based on his behavioral data (please refer to data on file), John who had attended school an average of two out of five days from October to December, had improved his school attendance to an average of four out of five school days. In addition, Mr. Jones noted that John was no longer presenting the problem of answering back to his teachers..."

6) Objective Court dispositions based on concrete findings.

Many probationers are often released from probation on the basis that the probationer's "...overall adjustment has been satisfactory".

On the other hand, a probationer's behaviorally stated release can be based on the fact that the probationer, who was presenting the problem behavior of school absence at a rate of 95%, had reduced it to 5% since placement on probation under a behavioral contract. Further, it can be stated that the probationer has not been involved in additional law violations and that his mother, who used to complain at lease once a week about the probationer's keeping irregular hours, stopped complaining.

Clearly then, the Court's disposition would be based on positive behavioral changes in the probationers, supported by observable and measurable behavioral data.

SELF-MONITORING AND EVALUATION

If the Buddy System techniques are implemented, they should be systematically evaluated. Procedures which prove to be successful can then be expanded, while those which are unsuccessful can be revised or eliminated. The evaluation plan recommended assumes that it would be impractical to randomly assign probation youths to different forms of treatment. For example, to use a contracting system with one group of youths and not with another and then compare outcomes for these two groups. Instead the evaluation could be based on an accurate record of information on each youngster. This information could then be correlated with outcome to determine what characteristics are associated with successful probation. The specific steps to accomplish this are outlined below.

I.. Information Before Probation. For every youngster placed on probation information would be collected and recorded on what is known about that youngster at that time. This information would include such observable and measurable variables as age, sex, school grade completed, ethnicity, family structure, previous contact with government agencies, previous offenses, current offense, etc.

II. Information During Probation. This category would be based on what is known about each youth during probation. Included would be such variables as age, sex, education,experience, and ethnicity of the youngsters' probation officer, time on probation, number of contacts with the probation officer, number of contracts with the probation officer, number of contracts successfully completed, type of contracts by behaviors, rewards, and penalties, data on the frequency of target behaviors, use of parents or school personnel, disposition, Internal-external scores of probation officer and youth (see Appendix B), etc.

All of this information may then be correlated with such outcome measures (both during and after probation) as number of arrests, interval to first arrest, probation completion or revocation, seriousness (classification) or arrest if any,etc. In this way the association between the information variables and outcome would be determined. Those data may also provide information on which approaches work best with what kind of youngsters, when administered by what type of probation officer. The use of each approach could then be expanded, revised, or eliminated.

References

Crandall, V.C., Katkovsky, W., and Crandall, V.J. Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcement in intellectual-academic achievement situations. Child Development, 1965, 36, 91-109.

Rotter, J.B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, (Whole No. 609).

PC-L-645 (Rev. 10/70)

APPENDIX A

IN THE FAMILY COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAII

F.C. No. _____

IN THE INTEREST OF

_____

Born _____ Age _____

CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

ORDER

You have been placed on probation under the authority of the laws of the State of Hawaii and a probation officer has been assigned to counsel and help you.

While you are on probation, you shall obey the following rules and any added special conditions.

1. Obey all laws and municipal ordinances.

2. Obey your parent or guardian.

3. Unless excused by this Court, attend school regularly. Do not behave at school in any manner which might cause you to be suspended or expelled.

4. If excused from school, obtain a job; do not quit or change jobs without your probation officer's approval. If discharged from your job, notify your probation officer within three days.

5. Do not remain away from your residence for more than twenty-four hours without first having obtained permission from your parent or guardian or your probation officer.

6. Notify your probation officer of any change of address and telephone number. You must obtain the court's permission if you plan to leave Oahu.

7. Follow instructions given you by your probation officer.

8. Report in person to your probation officer at such places and times as he may direct.

YOUR SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF PROBATION ARE:

8. Report in person to your probation officer at such places and times as he may direct.

YOUR SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF PROBATION ARE:

Failure to obey your conditions of probation may result in further court action for VIOLATION OF PROBATION.

Dated at Honolulu, Hawaii, this _____ day of _____, 19_____.

_____
FAMILY COURT REFEREE

The conditions of probation have been explained to me and I fully understand and accept them.

_____ _____
Date Probationer

APPROVED: _____
JUDGE

APPENDIX B

THE THIRD ACTION YEAR OF THE BUDDY SYSTEM: SOME ADDITIONAL RESULTS

The training, evaluation, and research of the third action year has been presented in report #9. The purpose of this appendix is to report some additional findings on the relationship between the internal-external dimension (I-E) and behavioral outcome.

The I-E dimension refers to how people view the source of control of their behavior. Internals tend to believe that what happens to them is a function of what they do; while externals tend to believe that it doesn't matter what they do, "whatever will happen will happen." It is analogous to the distinction between skill and luck or fate.

I-E tests were administered to both buddies and youngsters. The buddies completed an adult form (Rotter, 1966) and the youths an adolescent form (Crandall, Katkovsky, and Crandall, 1965). The purpose was to see how combinations of buddy-youth I-E scores related to improvement of the youngsters' target behavior. Data was available on 22 youngsters who were placed into one of three groups based on buddy-youth I-E scores as presented in Table 1. The higher the score the more externally oriented the individual.

Table 1

Group	Number of Youths	Average I-E Score	
		Buddy	Youth
Low-High	6	10	18
Medium	9	14	14
High-Low	7	18	10

The Low-High group consisted of youths with scores three or more points higher than their buddies' score; the Medium group, of youngsters whose scores

did not deviate more than 2 points in either direction from their buddy's score; and the High-Low group of those youths with scores three or more points lower than their buddy's score.

The results showed that while the target behaviors of youngsters in all three groups improved, those in the Medium group improved the most and those in the High-Low group the least (the correlations were +.51 and -.57 respectively).

It appears then that youngsters who are more internally oriented than their buddies (the High-Low group) do not improve as much as other youths. This may happen because these youths like to see themselves as controlling their own behavior, are placed in a system which attempts to control their behavior externally, and assigned a buddy who also believes in external control. As a result the system is less rewarding for them and they improve the minimum necessary to obtain the rewards offered in the Buddy System.

These results suggest that every attempt should be made to match buddies and youngsters so that their I-E scores are as equal as possible and youths should not be assigned to buddies with higher I-E scores.

In addition the buddies I-E scores also related to how much improvement the buddy showed on the pre-post tests of the training manual. The correlation was -.76, indicating that external buddies gained the least. Although gains on the training manual tests were unrelated to the youngsters' improvement of target behavior, it appears that internally oriented buddies are easier to train in the Buddy System. Thus it is recommended that recruitment priority for buddy positions be given to internally oriented applicants.